DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 352 852 FL 800 540

AUTHOR	Leahy, Meredyth A.
TITLE	Recommendations for Expanding and Enhancing Adult Education Staff Development in Pennsylvania.
INSTITUTION	Pennsylvania State Dept. of Education, Harrisburg. Div. of Adult Basic Education.
SPONS AGENCY	Department of Education, Washington, DC.
PUB DATE	Jun 86
NOTE	61p.
PUB TYPE	Reports - Research/Technical (143)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*Adult Basic Education; Change Strategies; English (Second Language); High School Equivalency Programs; *Inservice Teacher Education; Language Teachers; Professional Development; *Program Development; *Staff Development; *State Programs; Statewide Planning
IDENTIFIERS	*Pennsylvania

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this report was to develop a plan for adult education staff development directed towards enhancing and expanding the delivery of training to Adult Basic Education (ABE), General Educational Development (GED), and English-as-a-Second Language (ESL) staff in Pennsylvania. It is intended to provide guidance and direction to adult education staff development in the state, and to do so in a way that allows both short-term (i.e., GED teacher training) and long-term (i.e., increased participation) goals. Staff development activities since the 1950s are reviewed, including the 1972-75 regional adult education staff development efforts funded by the U.S. Office of Education. A short review of the literature covers the philosophy of staff development, assumptions regarding staff development, and competencies of the staff development specialist. Approaches to and issues of staff development in Pennsylvania, including the production of a "Handbook for ABE in Pennsylvania," are discussed, and efforts in other states (Virginia, Oregon, Michigan, Connecticut, Texas, and New Mexico) are similarly reviewed. Among the 20 recommendations for a revitalized staff development program in Pennsylvania are the following: centralize the program; make a 3-year commitment; divide the state into six regions to facilitate data collection, program evaluation, etc.; relate goals and objectives directly to the goals set forth in the state plan; establish close ties with local programs; and provide staff development specific to the needs of program directors. Issues in GED teacher training and priorities for ABE/ESL teachers are also described. It is concluded that staff development in Pennsylvania is problem-ridden but crucial because current methods are neither sufficient nor reliable. (LB) (Adjunct ERIC Clearinghouse on Literacy Education)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED352852

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR EXPANDING AND ENHANCING ADULT EDUCATION STAFF DEVELOPMENT IN PENNSYLVANIA

Meredyth A. Leahy
Consultant

June 1986

Pennsylvania Department of Education
Division of Adult Basic Education
333 Market Street
Harrisburg, PA 17126

Meredyth A. Leahy
1604 Cherrie Circle
Norristown, PA 19401

FL800540

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Meridyth A. Leahy
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Project No: 098-006047

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

This report is a result of a project supported in whole or in part by the U.S. Department of Education and the Pennsylvania Department of Education. However, the opinions expressed herein do not necessarily reflect the position or policy of the U.S. Office of Education or the Pennsylvania Department of Education, and no official endorsement should be inferred.

2 BEST COPY AVAILABLE

INTRODUCTION

The purpose of this report is to develop a plan for adult education staff development directed towards enhancing and expanding the delivery of training to ABE, GED and ESL staff in Pennsylvania. It is intended to provide guidance and direction to adult education staff development in Pennsylvania, and to do so in a manner which enables the Division to act upon both short-term goals, i.e. GED Teacher Training, and long-term goals, i.e. increase participation.

While Pennsylvania offers staff development and teacher training activities, these offerings are limited in their overall effectiveness by several factors.

A. The nature of the audience. A large majority of staff at the local program level are part-time employees, many of whom are employed full-time elsewhere, thus limiting their availability and willingness to participate in training activities. The addition, over the last year or so, of large numbers of volunteers adds yet another dimension and challenge to training.

B. The relatively low participation rate (20-25%) of the intended audience. Those who do participate appear to be committed to their own professional development, as demonstrated by their repeated participation. This effect leaves the state with only 25% of its staff which can be assumed to be sufficiently prepared to carry out their respective roles. The effectiveness of the remaining 75% is, at this time, an unknown.

C. The wide variety of programs, target populations, sponsoring agencies and locations (i.e., urban, rural, suburban, school district, community colleges, community-based agencies, federal, state and local correctional facilities, and hospitals) which operate on a part-time schedule with part-time staff.

D. The size of the geographical area which must be served and the extent to which the location of the training activity inhibits participation. Is it practical or realistic to expect a part-time employee to travel 3-4 hours for a 6-hour training activity?

E. The difficulty experienced in the present system in the identification of individual, local, regional and state-wide training needs and, in turn, the designing of appropriate staff development responses to those needs. While it can be assumed that there are training needs common to all programs, it must also be acknowledged that there exist training needs unique to each depending upon the population served and their setting.

F. The absence of a long-term planning process for the delivery of staff development or for the identification of training needs. The presence of such a void places the program in a position of being reactive rather than proactive. Without long-term goals and intermediate objectives, coordination is sporadic, participation is low, and the opportunity for communication with professionals in the field is often one way and limited to information giving as opposed to training.

On the other hand, Pennsylvania has in place several programs which are quite effective in and of themselves. AdvancE is considered to be among the best resource and dissemination centers in the country; many successful 310 projects in the area of curricula development have been funded; the "Buzz," the state-wide newsletter specific to ABE, is recognized and in place; the Mid-Winter Conference annually brings together several hundred adult educators and offers presentations relevant to the field; PAACE is strong and growing in numbers and strength; and finally, the Fall workshops are strong in tradition, and

provide, annually, current practice and research to those who attend and provide an opportunity for colleagues to meet and share with others.

The development of an overall plan with long-term goals is vital to Adult Basic Education in Pennsylvania. The current system, considering the above limitations and the size of the state staff, has been successful. However, it is apparent that the staff development program must be enhanced and expanded. The recently announced changes in the GED only serve to highlight the need for a comprehensive system of staff development which is designed and managed in such a way that it can not only assess and meet current needs, but anticipate future needs as well.

HISTORICAL HIGHLIGHTS

Prior to 1964, the preparation of teachers of adults nationally was given limited attention both within the profession and outside of the profession. In 1952, 270 schools for teacher education were training individuals for elementary and secondary schools which enrolled, at that time, approximately 28.5 million children and youth. By contrast, only a handful, 12-14 colleges and universities, were offering programs leading to a master's or doctor's degree in adult education. The training offered specifically for teachers of adults was offered through what were known as summer institutes. In 1951, only 36 institutions offered summer programs, even though most teachers of adults were trained as elementary or secondary teachers or were specialists in a subject but lacked training in education (Sheats, Jayne, Spence, 1953).

Even in the early 50's, the professionalization of teachers of adults was debated. Yet those within the field generally agreed that adults were different than children and youth and, therefore, the teaching of basic skills to adults required special knowledge and skills. Sheats, et al (1953), cites the December 20, 1981 issue of the Educator's Washington Digest, which lent credibility to this notion when it published a listing of the ten most pressing tasks for education in 1952. Among those appeared the following:

> Begin training a corps of workers for adult education so that the movement can take on new scope and power, emphasizing how adults may learn to make decisions in a democracy rather than merely acquire facts.

The 50's saw a beginning of a broader effort on behalf of adult literacy. Syracuse University's School of Journalism began a program to train individuals to write instructional materials for adults. The Laubach method, which began by introducing non-readers to the alphabet, became popular. An effort in Memphis, Tennessee, to teach illiterates how to read via televised lessons, used the Laubach approach. An finally, Baylor University began training volunteers to

teach adults. Soon after, Baylor established the first undergraduate curriculum in literacy education (Sheats, Jayne, Spence, 1953).

Adult Basic Education Legislation and Staff Development

In 1964 the Economic Opportunities Act, with its Title IIB provisions for adult basic education, and the subsequent Adult Education Act of 1966, placed illiteracy on the list of national concerns for the first time and efforts to train teachers and others to staff the programs began in earnest. Yet in 1962, only 15 institutions offered full master's or doctor's degrees in adult education (Griffith, 1970). A 1965 survey by Cortwrite revealed that only 17 institutions offered coursework in the area of literacy education, and few individuals were qualified to provide the training which was now to be made available across the country.

The 1964 legislation allocated funds for teacher training at the state level but not for the training of teacher trainers. The Ford Foundation in cooperation with the U.S. Office of Education (USOE) funded three two-week workshops in 1965 at the Universities of Maryland, New Mexico and Washington. It was intended that those who participated would return to their respective states and serve to train others.

The National Association for Public Adult Education (NAPSAE) coordinated and planned the three training of trainer's workshops. The Association developed a guide for trainers to use in short-term educational programs based upon the material gathered in the planning and experience gained in conducting the three workshops (Warren, 1966).

As previously cited, most adult basic education (ABE) teachers prior to 1964 were both trained and employed (or retired) as elementary or secondary teachers. The remainder were those who were knowledgeable or skilled in a content area but generally had no training in any aspect of education. Training

institutes provided by colleges and universities were offered during the summer months in order not to conflict with the full-time employment of those involved in the field. The enactment of legislation had little impact upon this pattern. Summer institutes and weekend workshops continued to be the means by which teachers, potential teachers and other staff were trained.

The majority of the sponsors of these institutes were colleges and universities. In a four year period, 1964-68, 4300 teachers, administrators and counselors were trained through 60 short-term, summer institutes and weekend workshops. A closer look at the institutes for this period reveals that they served two purposes. They provided training and they resulted in products: training guides, curriculum guides, guides for the evaluation of instructional materials, guides for the teaching of reading, math and English as a second language. In some cases, the institute produced in print the texts of the papers presented to those in attendance.

Reviews of these early efforts were mixed. Few included plans for follow-up. Evaluations were limited to favorable/unfavorable responses by participants and they included no pre- or post-testing. While content presented was rarely identified through needs assessments, attempts were made to identify what ABE teachers should know, what strategies they should be able to implement and what behaviors and attitudes were critical to a successful instructional program. However, for the most part, curricula was created from the experiences of ABE teacher-trainers, program administrators and classroom teachers. This resulted in the proliferation of a series of similarly unsophisticated ABE training programs which had the "effect of retarding acceptance of ABE as a profession" (Regan & Walsh), 1971).

Regan and Walsh (1971) noted that the institutes which appeared to be most innovative in their approach to teacher training were those funded directly by

USOE under Section 309B of the Adult Education Act. They were comprehensive in their presentation of what constitutes an ABE curriculum; gave attention to the teaching of the academic areas of reading, math and communications, as well as life skills, including parenting, the utilization of community resources, civic responsibility, job seeking and keeping skills, health and safety, and consumer skills. A majority of USOE institutes offered information relating to the psychological and sociological characteristics of the educationally disadvantaged adult and some approached problems which might arise due to the conflicting cultures, values, lifestyles, and communication patterns of predominately white, middle class (teachers) and adult basic education students.

A review, in some cases, of training project reports and, in others, abstracts of reports reveals, that as the years progressed, not only were the USOE funded institutes becoming more sophisticated and comprehensive in content but they were also becoming more innovative in the methods and techniques used to deliver that content. The earlier institutes (1964-65) relied heavily on lecture, small group discussion, work groups and case studies. By 1967, institutes were using demonstration and modeling, role playing, field visits, individual study, micro teaching, practicums, and video taping for replay, feedback and evaluation.

As was noted earlier, a number of the institutes of 1964-65 were staffed by "experts" who drew upon the experience of participants to develop products. By the late 1960's, staff rosters included, in addition to the "experts," ABE program administrators, teachers and students in an apparent effort to assure that the content delivered was reality-based and relevant to the participants and their respective programs.

Selection of participants, evaluation and data collection also grew more sophisticated. Early institutes generally reported level of satisfaction of the participants to the institute and/or judged success by the delivery of a product. Participants were most often a mix of state directors, administrators and teachers; the latter two selected by their respective state directors, a process which often resulted in the same persons attending several institutes.

By 1967, recommendations for future workshops and institutes included: conduct separate workshops for rural and urban ABE programs, provide for a more consistent method of participant selection, select staff associates from previous institute participants, and conduct separate administrator and teacher institutes (Fitzgerald, Hunter, 1967).

Institute reports published after 1967 reveal that evaluation was also changing. Institutes of three to four weeks in duration now included evaluations conducted two to three times during the activity, usually at the end of the first, second and/or third weeks. These evaluations were designed to provide feedback to institute staff which would indicate a need to adjust the program in some way (Seaman, Martin, Phillips, 1970).

Regional Adult Education Staff Development: 1972-75

In 1969, eight southeastern states were funded by the U.S. Office of Education (USOE) to develop a regional approach to Adult Education Staff Development (AESD). Based upon the success of that effort, USOE changed its funding pattern and called for the development of comparable projects in each of the other nine USOE Regions. Over the subsequent three-year period, 1972-75, $7,500,000 was allocated to establish ten regional Adult Education Staff Development Projects (DeSanctis, 1976).

While each of the regions followed the same general guidelines, each, in addition to staff development, developed its own focus. Region VIII focused on

the development of adult competency-based individualized training programs for ABE staff; Region X focused on the development of materials for the training of counselors. Region IV focused on dissemination, and others on rural adult basic education and English as a second language. Region III, which included Pennsylvania, focused on the definition of roles, the development of role responsibilities and competencies including knowledge, skills and attitudes necessary to carry out those responsibilities. Particular attention was given to the new role of staff development specialist, one which was to be assigned and developed in each state within the Region.

A number of regional projects experienced problems. In the case of Region IV, which had been in place for three years (1969-72), for the second three-year project they designed a dissemination system which for all intents and purposes should work. As a part of their planning process they identified a series of tasks to be undertaken during the first year of the second three-year project. Surveys were conducted to determine which resource or role was performing what activity. The results of the survey revealed that the state directors felt it was their role to determine needs and establish priorities. All others who functioned in the remaining five roles felt the same way. Avoiding the issue of the perceived power of the state directors (who in each case held the purse strings), the group conceded that:

> It was both impractical and improbable to assume that the State Directors can or must make all decisions concerning needs and priorities of the project because it was unlikely that one individual with vast responsibilities could remain aware of and alert to the training and information needs of particular programs and individuals throughout the state (Scott, 1973).

In his review of the Region II project, DeSanctis (1976) reported that although the states involved had mutually predetermined that the region would focus on competency-based teacher education (CBTE), the states and individuals involved also need a continuous flow of information about what was happening

across the country. The demand on the Region II staff to provide both hampered their ability to accomplish their primary goal. DeSanctis recommended that USOE follow the regional projects with funding for resource and dissemination centers within each region which would serve to meet what appeared to be a valid need.

In a position paper on the Region III AESD project, which included Pennsylvania, Ulin noted that at the end of the first year, it became apparent that while there appeared to be commitment and involvement, technical knowledge and ability, funds and facilities, the project was not bringing these resources into play or reaching project goals. An examination of the problems and successes revealed that the issue was not the lack of individual skills, but rather an inability to utilize these skills effectively within the organizational setting (i.e., state departments of education, higher education institutions, local education agencies). The reasons for the gradual abandonment of a system designed to provide a continuously updated survey of learning needs and resources suggest that these activities conflicted with institutional traditions or structures (Ulin, 1976).

SELECTED ASPECTS OF THE LITERATURE

The regional projects, 1972-75, proved to initiate a great deal of research and writing related to adult education staff development. This was a period during which philosophy and assumptions were formulated and competencies of staff development specialists were identified.

Philosophy of Staff Development

Staff development differs from other forms of teacher training. The word "staff" by definition implies a linkage between changes in learner behavior and changes in the organizations of which they are a part.

The primary purpose, therefore, of a staff development program is to improve the ability of both staff members and the organizations to respond to the changing demands of their shared work environment. Teacher training, on the other hand, focuses on the individual, provides learning experiences based on curricula content and skill needs; and is in line with the personal and professional goals of the individual.

> Staff development provides learning activities which derive from the interrelationship between individual needs and individual expectations and those of the organizations of which they are a part. New staff behaviors impact upon the structure, the policies, and the climate of the organization. The response of the organization in turn affects the behavior of the staff. Another dynamic is also operational. Organizations change their structure and policies in response to pressures for increased productivity, and for more effective utilization of their financial, physical and human resources. These changes impact upon the behavior and attitude of staff. How the staff responds to these pressures determines the effectiveness of organizations. New skills and relationships are required for the on-going process of analyzing the interaction between individuals and their organizations and for planning and delivering the necessary learning experiences (Ulin, 1976).

Assumptions Regarding Staff Development

DeSanctis (1974) proposed that staff development be viewed from the perspective of six underlying assumptions. He suggests that these assumptions

serve to better define the problems as well as provide a focus for what otherwise are "scattered and episodic" events.

To integrate staff development with ABE, it is proposed that the following assumptions be considered by those responsible for staff development:

1) Some adults have needs which have to be identified, categorized and integrated into an ABE instructional program. Furthermore, these adults possess knowledge, skills, attitudes and behaviors as well as other physical, psychological, cultural and social characteristics that must be understood in order for these needs to be adequately met.

2) These adults participate in formal learning environments because they feel that their needs can be met, at least in part, through such environments.

3) Within these learning environments there are teachers (or some euphemistic equivalents) who possess or should possess specific knowledge, skills, attitudes and behaviors that will assist the adult learner in meeting his needs.

4) There is a relationship between specific knowledge, skills, attitudes and behaviors of the teacher and movement toward the learning goals of the adult student.

5) The knowledge, skills, attitudes and behaviors necessary for effective teaching can be, at least in part, obtained through pre-service and/or inservice training.

6) Teachers will exhibit these competencies in their teaching situations after completion of training (DeSanctis, 1974).

In 1975, Hirschowitz, who viewed adult education staff development as a change process, presented the following assumptions:

1) The program should permit participants to pool, share and supplement their knowledge. It should link staff members with particular needs to those who have the experience and knowledge to meet those needs with the goal of enhancing knowledge and strengthening problem-solving skills of participants;

2) It should have an agreed-upon direction for movement. Refinement of knowledge and skills should move the organization toward precise operations and increased productivity;

3) The scope of the staff development program should be wide-ranging. Areas to be explored should include prevailing attitudes, opinions and beliefs about ends, means and missions; assumptions about human motivations in the system;

the structure of the organization, operations, and practices; administrative and leadership styles;

4) The sanctioning authorities should give active support to the program;

5) The program should seek quality and acceptance by the participants;

6) The participants should be involved in the pre-planning, design, implementation, monitoring, evaluation, and further evolution of the program (operationally, all levels of participating or user organizations should arrive at agreed-upon priorities for a local, state, or regional staff development program. This minimally involves institutions of higher education, state departments of education, and local programs.)

7) The staff development program should not be conceived of as something separate from or parallel to, the simultaneous development of program operations. It should be an organic, continuous process, intimately related to the change process in the organization (educational settings.) The staff development program can then provide a problem-solving arena and become an appropriate avenue for pre-service and inservice training emphasizing change agentry processes .

Hartwig (1977), Adult Education Consultant with the State of Iowa Department of Public Instruction, viewed staff development as a linkage process and offered the following propositions:

1) To be truly helpful and useful, trainers must be able to simulate the staff's problem-solving process;

2) To derive help from trainers (and resource systems) the staff must be able to simulate resource system processes, that is, to appreciate research knowledge, and understand how research knowledge is generated and validated;

3) Affective utilization requires reciprocal feedback;

4) Trainers need to develop reciprocal and corroborative relationships not only with a variety of potential programs but also with a large diverse group of other resource systems;

5) Staffs need to develop reciprocal and corroborative relationships with a variety of resource persons (trainers);

6) Both trainers and staff need a willingness to listen to new ideas (openness) as an important prerequisite to change;

7) Effective knowledge is a self-fulfilling prophecy: the staff's expectation that effort (in retrieval and application) will pay off is a good indicator that it will;

8) A willingness to take risks is an important requirement for successful innovation;

9) A willingness to make an effort to adapt innovation to one's own situation is an important prerequisite to effective utilization (a dimension of openness);

10) Those who already possess the most in the way of resources and capabilities are the most likely to get even more;

11) Anticipated profit (reward) is a major incentive for diffusers and users of innovation;

12) Rewarding encounters with new knowledge lead to expectations that future encounters will also be rewarding;

13) New ideas and innovations which clearly contradict pre-existing values will not get very far in a staff person's system, as will those which appeal to cherished values.

Competencies of the Staff Development Specialist

Job descriptions generally outline responsibilities in terms of expected results: to identify needs, to plan and conduct activities, etc. Analysis of the tasks and strategies utilized by Region III staff development specialists led Ulin (1976) to identify the following as competencies necessary for effective performance.

- an understanding that staff development occurs in organizational settings

- an understanding that the "clients" to be served include both educators of adults and the organizations within which they function

- an understanding that both organizations and individuals have needs, goals, expectations and values related to staff development which must be clearly articulated in order for a rational planning process to occur

- an understanding that individual and organizational goals, needs, expectations and values can sometimes conflict, and assisting those involved in confronting this reality, and in developing coping strategies

- an awareness that the results of this process of clarification and articulation will be unique to each organization and individual involved in the program

- knowledge of and ability to utilize a variety of strategies to assist the organization in the process of gathering information about its goals for staff development

- knowledge of and ability to utilize a variety of strategies to assist individuals in determining and articulating their learning needs

- an understanding of the need for developing trust relationships with the client organization and with individual participants in order to facilitate the flow of accurate information about learning problems and needs

- a recognition that there is a formal and informal structure within the various organizations; that both play a role in setting staff development goals and in developing plans for reaching them

- an ability to utilize a variety of strategies for involving both informal and formal groups in all stages of program planning and implementation

- an ability to utilize a variety of strategies to assist adult education staff in verifying the accuracy of information they have about the organizations in which they work in order to determine the feasibility of implementing program plans and new learnings

- an ability to identify, confront, and resolve "turf-protecting" behaviors

- an understanding of both the proactive and reactive nature of the role of staff development specialist; reactive in attentively and appropriately responding to identified needs; proactive in establishing an environment that nurtures inquiry, dialogue, exploration and experimentation.

Although each of these items can be viewed in terms of individual competence, it is also obvious that performance is dependent upon organizational support.

Experience suggests that the behaviors and attitudes described above are more than simple additions to the previously developed list of staff development functions. They may well be necessary preconditions that must exist in order to make it possible to effectively undertake the other tasks of staff development (Ulin, 1976).

In addition to competency, Ulin suggests qualities or traits which have an important impact in planning and implementing a staff development program. Included with the description of traits are statements about the way in which they appear to relate to program operations.

- ability to work comfortably in an environment with a high degree of ambiguity. It takes time and attention to establish work relationships and role expectations for this new position within the organization and with the variety of other client groups.

- comfort in viewing success in relative terms. Expectations of "full cooperation," "total commitment," "complete success" are particularly unrealistic for the new activities and relationships required in an adult education staff development program of this magnitude.

- ability to work comfortably without immediate feedback. Results of many developmental activities cannot be accurately determined in the short run and it is often necessary for the specialist to rely upon his or her own internal confidence and professional skill and maturity to satisfy feedback needs.

- ability to feel comfortable with the reality that both individuals and organizations have program concerns for which staff development can play no part

- ability to function as both an effective team member and as an independent worker as appropriate (Ulin, 1976).

In 1975, USOE transferred staff development responsibilities and monies over to the states, a move which brought about, in the opinion of many, a decrease in the effectiveness of both training and experimental activities (Hunter and Harman, 1979). In a report to the Ford Foundation, Hunter and Harman noted that such discretionary funds were allocated on a project grant basis and were not a part of an overall plan for equipping teachers.

However, criticisms of the AESD regional projects were in many cases valid. State directors, who while involved in the initial design, development and implementation of the projects, voiced concerns that the regional efforts had

simply become a convenient means to fund the development of graduate programs in adult education, implying that state directors questioned the value of graduate study. As a direct result of the Regional Projects, 21 new graduate programs were in operation. Others felt that the three year focus on one aspect of staff development (i.e. rural, counseling, ESL, etc.) was too lengthy and too narrow to equally benefit all states within the regions and all programs within the states.

In a more recent comparative study of adult literacy and basic education programs, Berlin (1984) noted that while the development of innovative approaches to literacy education and ABE staff development are actively supported by Section 310 of the Adult Education Act, ABE finds it difficult to implement proven innovations on a large scale. In most states, the report continues, there is no common base, no curriculum model within which all programs operate. While staff development and teacher training is generally offered on a state-wide basis, it often misses its mark for the same reason. Broad generalized approaches are taken, often leaving the adaptation, implementation and all related decisions in the hands of the local program and individual teachers (Berlin, 1984).

Bowes (1984) in his research on staff development found that two key elements are essential for designing successful programs. The first involves processes which strive to break down barriers. The second calls for constructing incentives. Some of the most common barriers to staff development successes are:

- participant's feeling that there is undue pressure to change;
- that their life schedules are over crowded;
- that there is likelihood of criticism;
- that the activities themselves are vague.

Other obstacles include:

- lack of money/sufficient funding
- general apathy
- poor planning
- lack of communication between teachers and administrators.

Incentives can be constructed by assuring:

- that participants see a reason for engaging in the activity;
- that they "accomplish" something;
- that they receive support from fellow participants;
- that the recognized changes which occur fulfill their purposes.

In addition:

- growth demonstrated should be related to the institutional reward system.
- widespread support from supervisors should be evidenced.
- risk taking and innovation should be encouraged.

STAFF DEVELOPMENT IN PENNSYLVANIA:

APPROACHES AND ISSUES

Pennsylvania's involvement in AESD has varied over the years and, due to lack of state funding, has followed federal guidelines and priorities. Prior to 1972, many Pennsylvania adult educators participated in summer institutes at least one of which was held in this state. Fall Saturday workshops became the means through which what was gained at summer institutes was passed on to the local level with institute participants often serving as trainers of administrators, counselors and teachers of adults.

As a participating state in the USOE Region III AESD Project, 1972-75, Pennsylvania moved quickly. By the end of the first six months of operation, Pennsylvania had funded three universities: Temple, Penn State and Indiana University of Pennsylvania (IUP) to initiate graduate programs in adult education. With primary assistance from Temple, the project had conducted 12-15 needs assessment workshops throughout the state; had conducted an administrator's workshop; 9 Saturday workshops; hired a full-time staff development specialist under contract with Temple University but housed in the Pennsylvania Department of Education's (PDE) Division of Adult Basic Education; and, offered adult education graduate courses through Temple at both its main campus and Capital Campus in Harrisburg.

As a direct result of the needs assessment activities in 1973, a two week summer institute/workshop was held at Beaver College which focused on individualized instruction and included the development of a scope and sequence of skills for ABE, a review and evaluation of instructional materials, and training in values clarification.

By the end of the second year of operation, in addition to 6-9 Fall Saturday workshops, the AESD project had offered workshops for teachers of

reading, taught by Penn State faculty; several workshops designed to meet the expressed needs of particular local programs; a three day workshop for corrections staff; a one week summer workshop for counselors and administrators at IUP; produced and disseminated a guide for teaching of reading; a guide for using values clarification in the classroom; and, several bibliographies of classroom instructional materials, including both print and audio visual resources. In development was a guide for teaching math, which was disseminated late in 1974.

During the final year of the project, staff development responsibilities were split among the participating institutions, and Pennsylvania prepared for the transition of staff development monies from the regional level to the state level.

In the years since, Pennsylvania has followed many routes in its efforts to deliver adult education staff development and to keep ABE professionals informed of developments both within the state and nationally. AdvancE, a resource and dissemination center, was funded at Millersville State College, and later moved to the State Library. In its early years, AdvancE served as a national model as other states moved to adopt and adapt the concept.

This aspect of staff development has proven to be the one area where the state has maintained a strong commitment. Continuous funding, in spite of changes in personnel and changes in location, has supported the development of a major resource center. The addition of AdvancE exhibits to the Saturday workshop format; its regular contribution to State ABE publications; and, its delivery of workshops devoted to the dissemination of successful special demonstration projects has given AdvancE visibility and credibility and made it a crucial arm in staff development efforts.

From 1976-78, Temple University continued its involvement with AESD. State funding supported the delivery of Fall workshops in Eastern and Central Pennsylvania. Several needs assessments were conducted and efforts were made to vary the program based upon identified training needs specific to regions within the delivery area. Problems experienced by the Temple program ranged from inability to accurately project attendance at any given site to restrictions imposed by PDE on topics to be covered and trainers to be used. PDE approved compensation for trainers varied and, in some cases, trainers received no more for preparing and delivering a workshop than did participants receive for attendance at the workshop.

The Temple Staff Development Project developed a newsletter and gathered the first mailing list of 500 ABE professionals in Eastern Pennsylvania. An AESD task force of local program personnel in Eastern Pennsylvania was established and proved to be a valuable source of guidance and extended the base of AESD program support to the local levels. In addition to the needs assessment, the task force, and the newsletter, the Temple project initiated and carried out seven additional efforts.

1. In 1977, Spring workshops were offered in four locations as a first time effort to provide training in addition to the Fall workshops. Graduate credit was offered as were CEU's. Staff were not offered the usual $50 reimbursement, and for this reason, local program administrators, in some cases, did not publicize the activities, and in others, discouraged attendance. In spite of the barriers, three of the workshops were held, and a total of 36 ABE teachers and administrators participated.
2. Working closely with state hospital related programs, the staff

offered a workshop for teachers which was held at Byberry State Hospital and staffed by experts in educational programming for emotionally disturbed and mentally retarded adults. The activity was conducted without direct support from available funds and project staff served only to bring together those with an identified training need and the appropriate resources.

3. The Project staff established and maintained close ties with AdvancE. The resource and dissemination center assisted with the development of needs assessment instruments and continuously provided publications from a variety of sources to AESD staff. The Center also provided materials relative to the topics covered in the workshops offered through the AESD project to both trainers and local program staff.

4. The Project offered, at the request of one local program, a full day workshop specific to that program's stated needs. While regional workshops could be considered to be successful, based upon evaluation results, this effort to provide local inservice, like similar efforts under the Region III AESD, proved to be far more successful. The involvement of local staff in planning and developing the activity gave credence to the importance of this step in the program development process which too often is overlooked.

5. Based upon recommendations of its task force, in June 1977, the Temple Project brought together eighteen teachers, counselors, supervisors and program directors from Eastern and Central Pennsylvania for a two day meeting to begin the development of an "Orientation/Introductory Packet for ABE Professionals."

The publication was intended to provide individuals a common base of knowledge regarding program operation, management, counseling and instruction. This meeting led to the establishment of working relations with IUP with the purpose of making the proposed handbook a statewide effort. With the withdrawal of Temple from AESD in 1978, the proposed publication was moved to IUP and was ultimately published FY 1980-81.

6. As an additional assignment, Temple was asked to assume responsibility for the development of an instrument for local program self-evaluation. The instrument was developed and delivered in April 1978 and became an integral part of the three year State Plan.

7. In 1977, Temple initiated a separate project which was modeled after USOE Region VIII's Individualized Training Program (ITP). While funded on a much smaller scale and for a duration of only 18 months, the project was effective in providing a means by which ABE program personnel could participate in guided, self-directed graduate level staff development activities for their own professional development. One aspect of the program vital to its success was the identification of human and site resources, individuals and programs in operation, which would serve as consultants/facilitators and/or models for those involved. Many ITP participants continued graduate work in adult education and remain active in the field today.

With the initiation of 310 funding and the hiring of a full-time staff member in PDE, responsibilities for staff development were returned to the Division. IUP remained involved and, as a part of its responsibilities, produced the

Handbook for ABE in Pennsylvania. Once again, a Pennsylvania developed concept served as a model for others to follow. Since its publication, however, the Handbook has lain fallow. Apparently, no effort has been made to re-evaluate its effectiveness and usefulness nor to update its content.

Initially, priorities for 310 Special Demonstration Projects and Teacher Training were developed by PDE. With the appointment of a 310 Task Force, PDE had established a means by which to gather input from professionals in the field. However, the fact that its members must reflect federal guidelines limits participation of those directly related to ABE, and may, in turn, limit the Task Forces' real usefulness in establishing priorities or identifying needs. With the appointment and continuous involvement of the State Plan Task Force, another mechanism has been set in place to bring together concerned and related individuals and agencies to assist on a regular basis in the development and implementation of the three-year state plans required by USOE.

Staff development in Pennsylvania continues to remain a challenge and, in some sense, a mystery. While there has been a great deal of activity in staff development and many delivery modes utilized, we have almost come full circle. Just as in the years prior to the Region III AESD project, PDE, for any number of reasons, now has full responsibility for staff development. The primary mode of delivery has become the Fall Saturday workshops. Most other major services: reimbursement and fiscal management, special demonstration projects, resource projects, collection and dissemination, the statewide newsletter, research and data collection, and more recently, literacy (0-4), have found a home with on-going direct or indirect support of the Division through its disbursement of Federal funds. Staff development has not.

In the last 15 years, staff development in Pennsylvania, as a function, have moved from PDE to colleges and universities, to related agencies and back

again with brief periods where it had one foot in a variety of camps. It has happened without long-term, purposeful planning and has addressed immediate and/or perceived needs with limited contact with, and input from, those most directly effected, the recipients of the training. This is not to say that staff development has not been effective. However, its inconsistency has contributed greatly to the State's inability to tap its real potential.

APPROACHES TO STAFF DEVELOPMENT IN OTHER STATES

A review of selected past and current efforts in other states with regards to staff development reveals a variety of approaches to training and the utilization of human resources.

Virginia

In addition to supporting an ABE state-wide, week-long conference and a resource and dissemination center, Virginia has established a Consultant Training Institute (CTI). The purpose of the Institute is to train a geographically representative group of ABE and ESL teachers to disseminate a particular 310 special demonstration project(s) relating to their experience and/or background. The participants are provided with the background and content of selected exemplary projects and are trained to serve as trainers/consultants, assisting in the adoption and adaptation of proven innovations, practices, and products. Skills addressed included conducting needs assessments, negotiating with local program directors, setting objectives, developing training plans, organization and delivery of a workshop, and evaluation and follow-up. Funds are available to pay the consultant/trainers and to reimburse local participants for travel and meals.

Virginia's annual training conference, Summer Adult Institute and Lyceum, provides graduate level training for 200 adult basic education professionals ear year with support provided for tuition, room, and meals. The basic format involves major instructional "strands" or intensive courses in several areas for three days, and uses the remaining time for large group sessions, 310 research and special demonstration dissemination sessions and small group enrichment/discussion groups. Free time and study time is built into the total program. Those who opt for graduate credit, complete additional readings and a final project which they complete after the Conference.

Oregon

In a similar vein, Oregon has established an Adult Education Talent Bank. The Oregon State Department recognizes that there are needs to be met which cannot be addressed in annual workshops and which are often temporary problems that need immediate attention, or, deeply rooted long-term problems which require a variety of approaches over a longer period of time. Oregon also recognizes that there are numerous ABE professional administrators and teachers who have the experience and the expertise to meet these needs. The Talent Bank serves as a central clearinghouse: collecting, verifying, and, finally, disseminating a state-wide listing of identified ABE consultants/trainers and their various areas of expertise. When the service has been rendered, the individuals are paid a per diem and travel expense. The trainer/consultant submits a summary of the services provided and a summary evaluation. They are granted release time from their ABE positions by their local supervisor who must approve the scheduling of time away.

Michigan

Michigan, through its Staff Development Collaborative, identified 14 facilitators located throughout the state who served to stimulate and, in some cases, deliver staff development planning and programming. Michigan then trained adminstrators and lead teachers in leadership, planning and training skills. At the same time, the Collaborative conducted needs assessments and identified additional resources to be made available to local programs.

Incentive grants were made available for further development of selected special demonstration projects for replication and adaptation by other programs. This aspect of the program was supported on-site by the Collaborative facilitators and trainers.

Of the projects reviewed, the Michigan Collaborative appears, on paper, to be loosely structured and geared more towards encouraging staff development than actually delivering it.

Connecticut

The Adult Education Staff Development Center in Connecticut delivers pre-service and inservice training to local programs, conducts state-wide workshops, and provides technical assistance through on-site visits, telephone consultation and correspondence. In addition, they provide intensive assistance to ten programs a year. The Center, which houses an extensive collection of print and media resources, also publishes a newsletter (Conntact) to keep ABE professionals informed of targeting information and practices in adult education. In its second year of operation (1984-85), the Center provided services to approximately 1400 adult educators, for a total of 3150 instances of technical assistance (an increase of 22% over Fall 1984).

The Center is staffed by two full-time professionals, one full-time trainer, a full-time administrative assistant, and a part-time librarian. The Center identified and utilized additional resource persons from throughout the state to serve as mentors or coaches and to provide training, consultation and intensive long-term assistance. Due to the steady annual increase in the utilization of services, the Center intends to add a part-time secretary and, like Oregon and Virginia, will begin training trainers to further assist project staff in meeting training needs in specific content and geographic areas.

In 1984-85, staff and trainer/consultants offered 36 workshops which ranged from one (1) hour in duration to a 24-hour Computer Software Institute. The average workshop lasted three and three-quarter hours. Participants ranged in numbers from three to 100. Aside from three major workshops which drew 100, 100 and 80 participants respectively, the workshops averaged 14 participants. Of the

36 workshops, 12 were state-wide, 19 were local, three (3) regional, one (1) national, and one (1) international. In addition to workshops, the Center supports and encourages visitation to other programs and staff, opportunities for exchanging ideas and techniques, reading recommended materials, individualized learning contracts, and participation in university course work.

Reimbursement for participation is staff development activities is generally left up to each program director. Prior to recent budget cuts, teachers were paid their hourly salary, which in Connecticut ranges from $8-15 per hour. Currently, more and more directors are offering a $5 per hour token stipend. While there are complaints about the reduction, the increase in requests for assistance and training indicates that the resistance has subsided somewhat. The Connecticut project openly recognizes the importance of a "positive climate" for professional development, which is actively fostered by a variety of elements - openness and trust, importance and validity of release time, opportunities for sharing, building a positive "spirit" among staff members, and moral and financial support from administrators at all levels.

Iowa

Iowa's Telenet was initiated through 309 monies in 1975, and today links 28 sites, all of Iowa's community colleges and vocational schools, with audio-teleconferencing. At each site, participants can talk and listen to other participants an any or all of the other sites simultaneously. Each site can accommodate small or large groups. The system, which virtually eliminates costs related to travel as well as time spent "on the road," is used for meetings, adult and continuing education courses, conferences and workshops, special lectures, press conferences, and discussion groups.

Like Pennsylvania, Iowa has a large geographic area to contend with and, through the system, provides services/resources to areas which otherwise would often go without.

Texas

While specific descriptive data regarding the current staff development activity in Texas has not been acquired, it supports a resource and dissemination center, TRENDS, which also assists in dissemination and local adoption of instructional programs and products.

In 1979, Texas, through the Adult and Extension Education Program at Texas A & M, pilot tested four approaches to competency-based staff development (CBSD). Each approach represents an attempt to get closer to pure CBSD. Of the four, the first, the Pre-Post workshop model is most like th workshops offered in Pennsylvania, except for the fact that a pre-assessment and post-assessment is conducted both prior to the workshop and after. Each model thereafter becomes more individualized and more specific in the training need addressed.

While the models and the analyses of each may prove useful in selecting training approaches, they are also relevant in that the competencies around which they were designed and intended to meet were identified through a previously funded grant. The two efforts, together, served to provide structure, continuity and direction to Texas staff development efforts.

New Mexico

In his review of New Mexico's program, Bowes (1982) noted that "often the staff development function has been that of an 'add-on' activity, which serves only partially to remedy immediate problems." The New Mexico State Department of Education (SDE), in its efforts to build a comprehensive program, centralized staff development by basing it at the University of New Mexico. They approached it from the point of view that in order to be effective, it must become integrated into the overall priorities and purposes of the total organization and be incorporated into the regular and continuous process of program development and improvement.

Bowes states that:

> In striving to have a long-term impact upon the performance of ABE teachers which in turn can lead to the subsequent improvement of their students, it is essential to incorporate on-going staff development activities into the teacher's normal expectations and schedule.

Among the most successful activities undertaken in New Mexico, the following have potential for Pennsylvania:

1) Based on the premise, which is well substantiated in staff development research and literature, that practitioners should be involved in planning, conducting and evaluating staff development activities, the New Mexico project set up various mechanisms to support and sustain continuous involvement. A project-wide advisory group was implemented. The advisory group, working with project staff, then appointed and assigned tasks specific to aspects of the program development process to various ad hoc planning groups. The utilization of program directors and practitioners, as viable components in the total program, generated support for the program by providing a mechanism through which their perceptions of needs, priorities for programs, and recommendations for methods of delivery could be solicited and recognized as valuable.

2) The project identified practitioners with particular knowledge and skill areas, who served as team members and individual consultants in visiting other programs in the state for varied purposes. Building upon the peer review concept used in other states, these individuals and teams served as evaluators, workshop leaders, material development specialists, and technical assistance personnel.

3) In response to the need to provide graduate courses to those requesting it, and the wide-spread geographic area to be covered, the University designed a nine-credit field-based core program which was aimed at assisting local ABE teachers in improving their knowledge and skills. The graduate program reached all locations through three distinct activities. The first was a course taught partially at centralized local sites, partially through regional workshops and partially through correspondence study. This course was designed to provide basic competencies in the knowledge of adult learners and in the instructional processes in adult basic education.

The second three-credit activity concentrated on development of instructional materials for local student needs. It was organized as a self-guided experience with assistance given by project staff through visits, phone calls and meetings at state and regional conferences and workshops.

The final course was a supervised internship. Each teacher was placed in a local community/educational agency in order to learn more about that setting and to strengthen the link between the services and activities of the agency and the local ABE program. Project staff served to identify internship opportunities, establish goals and objectives, and evaluate the value of experience.

4) Program emphases, whether local, regional or state-wide, have been based on multi-level needs assessments. At one level, they have included local input, advisory group recommendations, suggestions from the SDE, and requests from the state professional

association. On another level, the University conducted on-going data gathering through three distinctly different activities.

In 1981, a major survey was conducted to determine prior staff development participation, to identify a set of feasible logistical considerations in preparing future programs and to catalogue preferences for content offerings.

In 1982-83, each local site was monitored by an assessment team, comprised of a faculty member and peer evaluators. The reports described staff development priorities as reported by teachers in face-to-face interviews and provided a state-wide profile of the status of local programs.

In Fall 1983, a survey research project was carried out to identify specific format and content preferences. The 1983 research revealed that teachers preferred localized activities which could be undertaken through self-directed learning activities. They indicated that they preferred learning with fellow staff members using the local director as a resource person/facilitator. Based on the success of limited piloting of self-directed learning projects in 1984, New Mexico has embarked on a three-year plan to further develop the concept and provide, along the their other activities, options for self-directed staff development.

Through the years, New Mexico's AESD project, funded since 1979 with 310 monies, has developed a comprehensive and responsive professional development program. Like Connecticut, New Mexico has integrated its program with the overall ABE effort. It has implemented a wide range of professional development activities which include: establishing and facilitating site visitations,

curriculum development projects, summer institutes, regional workshops, technical assistance/consulting teams, a resource center, lecture series, graduate courses, internships and, more recently, self-directed learning activities. It has conducted multi-level and complementary approaches to needs assessments on a regular basis. It has systematically identified and effectively utilized human and material resources. Finally, New Mexico has provided for the involvement of ABE professionals in the development, delivery, and evaluation of these adult education staff development programs.

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR IMPLEMENTATION OF A REVITALIZED STAFF DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM IN PENNSYLVANIA

Based upon both the literature and research in staff development and the successful experiences of Pennsylvania and other states, the following recommendations are offered:

1) That Pennsylvania centralize its staff development program and that the responsibility for planning, implementation, coordination, and evaluation be given to a single agency. The experiences of Connecticut, New Mexico, California, and other states demonstrate that such an approach is a viable one.

2) That a three-year commitment be made to such a relationship between a single agency and PDE, with review being an on-going activity and renewal an annual activity. The agency selected must be viewed as a partner, not a competitor, with the purpose of removing constraints and giving flexibility to the program.

   Problems such as those experienced by Pennsylvania during the USOE Region III project need not occur again if realities are clearly defined and acknowledged; and an element of trust is established between PDE staff, local programs, and the agency responsible for staff development, with both successes and failures being shared at this early state. At every level, staff development should be perceived as a mutually beneficial activity with the ultimate benefactor being the student.

3) That, for the purpose of data collection, program evaluation, identification of needs and delivery of training, Pennsylvania be divided into six geographic areas, each with large population centers and/or program(s). A natural delineation would be North-

west (Erie/Meadville); Southwest (Pittsburgh); North Central (State College); South Central (Harrisburg, Lancaster, York); Northeast (Wilkes-Barre/Scranton/Hazelton); and Southeast (Philadelphia and surrounding area). The division of the state and further refinement of data would assist in matching needs with resources; in addition to sharing and exchanging information among programs. By cutting travel time and distance to workshops and localizing identified needs, we may increase participation. For example, is there a particular geographic area with large numbers of volunteers or uncertified teachers? Is there an area of high turnover? Is there an area where few participate in staff development? If a need is identified by a few individuals in a state-wide survey, is that need spread across the state or in a particular area? Is there a geographic area where a majority of particular types of programs (corrections, hospitals, community-based) exhibit the same problem?

4) That staff development goals and objectives be directly related to the goals set forth in the State Plan and should be communicated as such. The State Plan, when supplemented by multi-level needs assessments, can provide the rationale for a corresponding three-year plan for staff development.

5) That two underlying goals of staff development be (1) to foster consistency in all aspects of staff development, and (2) to increase participation. Efforts should be made to determine both barriers to participation and factors which support and reward participation.

Other than the three-year period of the USOE Regional project, staff development in Pennsylvania has remained open to change with each new fiscal year. While Fall workshops have been offered every year, their number has varied from as few as three to as many as nine. Attendance has varied from so few as to be embarrassing to as high as 250, twice the anticipated number. Participation rates have varied from an estimated high of 75-80% to the current low of 25-30%. Over the years, they have received "mixed reviews," regardless of whether attendance was viewed as mandatory or purely optional.

Involvement of local staff in the planning and setting of priorities has been inconsistent and sporadic. It has varied from none, to a lengthy series of needs assessment workshops; to input from regional task forces and advisory committees; to formal needs assessments; to the current level of input from the 310 Task Force; or any combination of the above. In some cases, such involvement proved to be valid. Programs were delivered which were directly related to the need expressed. In others, such involvement turned out to be for "appearance sake" only.

6) That staff development establish close ties with local programs. All other ancillary services provided, i.e., newsletter, resource dissemination, etc., are done at a distance and are impersonal. Face-to-face contact is not necessary to their success or effectiveness. Staff development, on the other hand, must establish and maintain a different kind of relationship. It must be politically neutral, academically qualified, objective and decisive; while, at the same time, it must also be open, supportive, under-

standing, judgement free, and responsive to programmatic needs at all levels. In order to do so, those responsible for staff development must be given direct access to local programs and personnel, and should, in fact, be required to make regular program visits.

7) That a Staff Development Advisory Board be appointed, with no more than 12 members, to assist in guiding the program and serving as an initial mechanism to gain local support. Appointments can be made on a rotating basis, but should first and foremost cover the span of the state geographically and programmatically. Its members should have a direct relationship to ABE/GED/ESL. The first task of the Board should be to assist in the development of a three-year plan for staff development.

8) That an effort be made to provide staff development specific to the needs of program directors. Over the years, program directors as a group have received little in the way of staff development. A review of recent 310 special demonstration projects and Fall workshop topics reveals that few, if any, of the program have been directed at making the local program director a better manager, administrator, supervisor, communicator, or advocate of adult basic education. Program directors' involvement in and support of staff development is crucial to its success. The attitude of the director towards staff development determines whether or not his/her staff willingly participate.

The difference between technical assistance and staff development should be defined and clarified. Both are vital, and the terms should not be used interchangeably. Administrators meetings,

such as those at which 306 guidelines are disseminated, are a form of technical assistance.

9) That the program establish and maintain close working relationships with staff of AdvancE, the resource and dissemination project, and with "What's the Buss," the state-wide ABE newsletter. Each has a vital role in staff development and those roles should be clearly delineated, coordinated, and mutually supported.

10) That, as a part of the staff development effort, Ad Hoc Task Forces be appointed to assist and guide the program on specific tasks - i.e., GED teacher training, development of the purpose and format for the Individualized Education Plan (IEP) required by the up-coming Three-year State Plan, development of a talent bank of practitioners, conducting needs assessments and subsequent planning and evaluation of training activities, etc. These task forces would be designed to be short-lived, have clearly stated purposes, and disband when their work is done. Such activities would serve to utilize the expertise of program personnel, and further extend the support for staff development and program evaluation throughout the local level.

11) That, in the first year of operation, the program develop a Talent Bank by systematically identifying ABE personnel with particular knowledge/skill/interest areas who will serve, as needed, as disseminators of proven practices and innovative programs, trainers, consultants, and/or peer evaluators for local programs. The program should financially support such activities, develop a process for monitoring such activities, and for disseminating information about the availability of such services to all programs.

12) That, before the Talent Bank becomes operational, the program (a) provide clearly stated guidelines and training to its members to assist them in carrying out the variety of tasks expected of them; and (b) provide guidance to program directors in how to use such individuals most effectively and efficiently.

13) That, with input from the field, the program develop a series of workshop outlines around selected high-priority needs to insure that the training delivered is consistent each time a topic is addressed, whether given by the same or different trainer. Each outline should include learning objectives; competencies to be developed; recommended learning/training activities and resources; a recommended time period; and evaluation, follow-up, or application activities.

14) That the staff development program address the training of trainers. Where it is determined that a particular topic must be addressed state-wide, teams of trainers should be identified by region, and prepared to deliver the training, including where necessary, training for trainers. Areas of high, wide-spread priority during the first year of operation would be training in preparation for the new GED, and as such, this single effort would serve to pilot the regional approach to training.

During subsequent years, additional high priority areas can be identified and, again, a corps of trainers can be prepared to deliver training. A priority for the second year would be the implementation of the IEP state-wide. During the first year, IEP can be designed by an Ad Hoc Task Force, the training module/program developed, and trainers trained during the summer months to

be ready to deliver training during the Fall on a regional and/or local level.

Training trainers is a particularly viable approach for Pennsylvania. The state is large, and while staff development can be managed centrally, it can be regionalized and localized in its delivery. Program staff will serve to develop, direct, manage, and coordinate a network of varied activities. The Advisory Council, Ad Hoc Task Forces, Talent Bank members, and regional trainers will all serve as the program's on-going link to local programs. Such a network might serve to effect and affect the whole concept of staff development. Under the previous system of selecting trainers for workshops, there existed literally no connection between the trainers and the participants prior to, or following, that training experience. Trainers appeared, delivered their training, and disappeared. The implementation process required that training be delivered over a long period of time as the troupe moved from workshop to workshop, site to site.

The regional approach will place the resources physically and psychologically closer to the programs. With careful preparation of both trainers and program directors/staff, expectations can be raised. The training will have a clearer purpose; trainers should do a better job of training; and, programs can be expected to yield the desired change. Communication will be facilitated and trainers can be required to make follow-up visits to selected programs to assess and clarify the impact of training.

In addition, training can take place around the state concurrently. While it is important that state staff be represented, it should not be viewed as absolutely necessary. It may be that program staff can not be present at each regional workshop; therefore, members of the Advisory Board, when properly prepared and briefed, can serve to represent program staff. The priority should be timely delivery of appropriate training, not scheduling training to meet travel requirements of a small staff or group of trainers.

15) That the staff development program design multi-level mechanisms to effectively and continuously assess and define needs of ABE local program directors, supervisors, counselors, and teachers, as well as those of particular types of programs, i.e., hospital, corrections, rural, urban, etc. In turn, the program should design multiple delivery systems which are both appropriate to meeting needs at all levels, and which would most likely bring about participation. Several staff development alternatives should be offered annually, and local staff members should be free to choose the alternatives to be pursued.

Needs assessments should be reviewed for effectiveness and the format should be revised if necessary. Each formal assessment can serve to guide the next and should also form the basis for clarifying needs identified through the Advisory Board, the Ad Hoc Task Forces, and local program personnel. With the implementation of recommendation #3, the data received will be more refined and far more useful to those responsible for the planning and delivery of staff development.

16) That, in the first year, the program develop a means by which to maintain a permanent record of each ABE staff member's participation in all program-sponsored activities. Recording participation places value on that participation and communicates the value to all involved. A periodic review of the records can reveal who has received what training, who has not participated in any training, and which programs ignore training opportunities. Until we record participation, individual/professional and program development is difficult to expect, evaluate, or reward.

17) That the program develop a strategy to support and encourage individualized, self-directed staff development. At every workshop it is apparent that at least one individual is motivated to go further in his/her own learning on that given topic. The survey conducted by AdvancE revealed that 121 individuals viewed self-directed learning as a viable option to workshops, conferences, etc.

18) That the program explore and develop, for implementation in the second year of operation, a means by which to provide access to graduate study for ABE staff.

19) That the program explore the feasibility of reciprocal training arrangements/agreements with other agencies at state and local levels. It has become apparent that other agencies do provide training pertinent to ABE staff. It is likely that ABE training may be appropriate for staff of other agencies. Initial discussions could take place within the State Plan Task Force which, by its membership, is representative of many organizations/agencies, i.e. labor, community action, aging, etc.

20) That PDE continue to encourage and support attendance at the annual Mid-Winter Conference. The Mid-Winter Conference, co-sponsored with PAACE, has earned the reputation of being among the best of the state conferences. Over the years, PDE involvement, and reimbursement for attendance of ABE professionals, while understandably limited in its scope, has remained constant. The Conference serves to not only provide valuable information and staff development opportunities, but also serves as a vehicle for professional involvement, commitment, and advocacy not possible through any other means. The annual conference and the partnership between PDE and PAACE is one which should be mutually respected and nurtured.

PROGRAM DIRECTOR AND

GED TEACHER TRAINING

Pennsylvania, with the impending changes in the GED, has an opportunity to meet immediate needs and, in doing so, pilot several new approaches to staff development. For the first time, major curriculum and programmatic changes are being required simultaneously of all GED programs.

Correspondence to Dr. John Christopher from this author in February 1986 outlines a preliminary approach to staff development for teachers in this particular area of need. Further research, the experience of two workshops and the data gathered through those workshops has not altered that plan to any great extent. However, this report now includes needs of program directors as well. The recommended plan and its rationale follow.

I. Analysis of the Planning Context and Client Systems to be Served

A. It is reasonable to expect that fewer adults will be able to pass the GED exam without formal preparation, thus bringing about an increase in enrollment.

B. Teachers will be faced with an even broader scope of student ability, ranging from those who need extensive instruction in all of the content areas to those in need of only the higher level skills in math, writing, problem solving and critical thinking skills.

C. Success in addressing the skills required by the new exam can be readily seen by the percentage of students who pass the exam.

D. Until very recently, very little, if any, formal instruction had been offered in the areas of the teaching of writing, the teaching of problem solving or critical thinking skills in teacher preparation programs. As a result, certified teachers may be no better

prepared to assimilate the new requirements into their instructional programs than non-certified.

E. Informal surveys of participants in the recent GED workshops indicate that programs vary in the way they assign teaching staff to GED content areas. Roughly one-half of the programs have individual instructors teaching all subject areas. About one-third of the instructors teach combinations. Reading, English and social studies is one commonly found combination; with math and science being the other. The remainder, less than one-fifth, assign teachers to single subject areas. Data regarding how many teachers are teaching in areas in which they are also certified is not available.

F. When asked how many teach writing, speaking and listening skills, roughly one-fourth, one-eighth and one-seventh, respectively, responded in the affirmative. However, area advisors question whether one-fourth are currently engaged in any structured approach to the teaching of writing. It should be noted that questions regarding the teaching of speaking and listening skills were asked because they are crucial prerequisites to the development of writing and reading skills. With adults, these skills can be developed concurrently as encoding skills (speaking and writing) and decoding skills (listening and reading).

II. Assessment of Needs

A. The needs assessment conducted by AdvancE, Spring 1986, revealed that "in-depth analysis of the new GED test" ranked as the number one concern. Since most programs operate at least one GED class, it is assumed that the need is wide-spread geographically and is

a concern of both directors and teachers. Considering the number and extent of the changes in the exam, it is apparent that program personnel are requesting clarification of what the changes are before articulating what specific training needs must be met in order to implement the changes.

It is interesting to note that "techniques for the teaching of essay writing" ranks sixth in the survey, and is the only other training need relative to the new exam which appears on the list. Had the survey been done after the Grantville, Pittsburgh and Harrisburg workshops, the result, no doubt, would have been quite different.

B. The overwhelming response to the GED workshops (Pittsburgh and Harrisburg) indicates that the changes in the exam are of far greater concern than the survey would indicate.

C. An informal assessment of needs, conducted during the two previously mentioned workshops revealed that those who attended were better able to identify their staff development needs. Questions and concerns focused on four areas.

1. How do we (teachers and directors) prepare for the implementation of new curriculum into the existing one? Program personnel whose programs followed an open enrollment policy expressed the greatest concern about the impact of the new instructional requirements on a curriculum which is ostensibly highly individualized. General concern was expressed by all participants regarding how to teach writing when attendance is sporadic and inconsistent.

2. Participants asked about what kind of instructional materials would be available and when?

3. What kind of help will be available in the way of staff development?

4. How is writing taught, and how will the essay portion of the exam be scored and by whom?

D. Workshop evaluation instruments which asked participants to identify additional training needs revealed that:

1. 92 participants requested additional assistance in the teaching of critical thinking skills (a skill which cuts across all subject areas on the new exam).

2. 73 participants requested more assistance in incorporating writing into the curriculum. Only four specifically requested assistance in how to teach writing and how to score essays. It appears that the actual day to day teaching of writing has not yet risen to the surface. Program personnel are still struggling with the logistics of getting it into the current program structure and curriculum.

   It should be noted here, as well, that unlike the ABE curriculum, GED has not received a great deal of attention regarding new and innovative methods, techniques, content or approaches. In addition, unlike ABE staff, GED staff are faced with no other option but to comply.

3. 51 participants requested assistance in the teaching of higher level math skills. The relatively high number of participants who identified this need implies that those currently teaching math are not certified to teach math

(possibly a high percentage of the 50% who teach all subject areas). When one considers that secondary math and science teachers are in great demand, and English social studies teachers are not, is it safe to assume that a higher percentage of GED instructors are certified in low demand subject areas and, as a result, seek employment in ABE/GED?

It also implies that participants are not looking to their local districts for assistance or to individual teachers to upgrade their skills in this area on their own.

4. When on reviews the data collected at the workshops, it is apparent that teacher training is not the only need. Program directors are expressing several needs which should be addressed as soon as possible. Until they can feel comfortable incorporating the changes, the anxiety level may remain too high for teacher training to be effective.

III. Development of Objectives

Based upon data gathered, overall objectives emerge regarding the GED.

A. To assist GED program directors to examine the full impact of the new GED on overall program design, staffing patterns, scheduling and curriculum.

B. To provide staff development activities for teachers which address the following:

- teaching of writing
- holistic scoring of essays
- teaching of critical thinking skills across the content areas

- teaching of problem solving skills across the content areas.
- teaching of upper level math and science skills.

IV. Selection Design and Ordering of Instructional Processes

A. Program Directors are their own best source of answers to the concerns and questions raised. However, it is crucial that PDE support and facilitate the process and provide the opportunities for solutions to be developed.

It is recommended that three all day, regional staff development activities be scheduled early Fall 1986. The activity, led by a facilitator and assisted by state staff, should focus on helping program directors to:

1. assess the current status of their respective programs with regard to funding, design, staffing, scheduling and curriculum, in order to clarify what is currently in place.
2. more thoroughly examine the implications of the new exam on program funding, design, staffing, scheduling and curriculum.
3. determine what, if any, changes must be made with regard to each of the five areas.
4. develop procedures and a time-line for implementing the necessary changes at the local level.

Projected Costs:

150 program directors travel, meals	@ $50	$7500
Facilitator - 1 planning day, 3 meeting days, travel and lodging		850
	Total	$8350

B. GED Teachers. The preparation of teachers to implement the curriculum changes required by the new GED has to be carefully planned and must be a total effort. The changes cannot be implemented by offering the training in a fragmented, smorgasbord approach. It is conceivable that most every GED teacher, except those who teach only math and science, must know how to teach writing. Every teacher must know how to teach critical thinking and problem solving skills. Those who teach math and science need to upgrade their skills.

In the areas of math and science, it may be necessary to gather far more data than is currently available. What specific knowledge/skill areas are addressed in both the math and science exams? What is the knowledge/skill level of those who currently teach math and science? What is the discrepancy between the two? To what extent can/should the discrepancy be met by staff development, or self-initiated instruction, and how much can be overcome by seeking out and hiring more qualified staff? Programs where one instructor teaches all subject areas may find the total amount of training necessary to be formidable and may be forced to change staffing patterns.

Because the teaching of writing can be used as a vehicle to teach analytical and critical thinking skills and problem solving skills, and because more teachers will need more training in these three areas, it is strongly recommended that the initial staff development effort be focused in these areas.

This training should be offered in a "package deal." Teachers must commit to the total program in order for the training

to be cost effective. Therefore, the training should be offered in manageable proportions, as close to local programs as is feasible.

Because training will have to be offered in a relatively short period of time across a large geographic area, and because follow-up support is likely to be necessary, it is highly recommended that a team of teacher trainers be developed who will ultimately be responsible for training all GED teachers in Pennsylvania. This plan requires that:

1. Primary trainers be identified and curriculum be developed.
2. Twelve to eighteen GED teachers be identified (a minimum of two from each of the six geographical areas) to be trained to serve as teacher trainers.
3. These individuals be trained in the teaching of writing, the scoring of essays, the teaching of critical thinking and problem solving skills and in methods and techniques necessary to deliver training activities.
4. A series of three workshops be conducted by the trainers, individually or in teams, Fall 1986.

Workshop 1. The first workshop of the three part series will last for 3-3½ hours and focus upon introducing the new GED requirements; assisting teachers to overcome anxieties or perceived barriers to the teaching of writing; the diagnosis and placement of students in a writing program; and, holistic scoring.

Workshop 2. The second workshop will require a full day of training (6-7 hours) and can be scheduled with the Fall work-

shops. This workshop will focus on instruction, and will include content; approach; types of writing assignments; sequencing of skills; major writing problems; developing instructional management strategies; and, writing across the content areas.

Workshop 3. The third workshop, scheduled no more than 2-3 weeks after the second, will run 3-3½ hours. It should focus upon evaluating and grading student writing; the teaching of critical thinking and problem solving skills through composition; techniques; and, a final summary of the total program.

Using the same trainers, format and curriculum, a second cycle of workshops can, if deemed necessary, be offered Spring 1987. The first cycle consists of 12-18 trainers delivering workshops and providing follow-up assistance to approximately 150 GED teachers. The second cycle would add another 150 teachers to the total number trained.

Projected Costs:

Primary trainers:	$ 3,000-5,000
Training trainers:	
1,000-1,200/trainer covers entire first cycle including training, and first round of workshops.	12,000-24,000
Teacher training reimbursement: $50-100/teachers trained (first cycle only)	7,500-15,000
Sub Total	$22,500-34,000

It is recommended that training for math and science teachers take place Spring 1987 and be preceded by more comprehensive and systematic data gathering.

55

ADULT BASIC EDUCATION/ESL

Identification of priorities for ABE and ESL teachers with the data available from the AdvancE survey is difficult. Obviously, information about the new GED took precedence over all other areas. To what extent is not clear. Data about how many individuals actually cited other topics, if available, should be studied before topics are selected. Were these topics selected by teachers or were they perceived by program directors to be training needs? If 50 individuals selected learning disabilities as a topic, are these 50 spread across the state? If so, can we assume it is a need great enough to support, through participation, a repeated presentation of a workshop on the topic in each of the recommended six geographical areas?

A review of the results of the AdvancE survey reveals that there are some identified needs which form content clusters. Because similar topics appear at various points in the rank order list, it implies that the need is there; although, again, to what extent and where in the state is not clear. As a result, a staff development program focused on any of the needs cited is risky without further data. We do not know if they are real needs or perceived needs, or if the need will still exist ten months form the time the survey was conducted.

Clusters by apparent priority are as follows:

Retention:

Rank	
3	Retention of students
4	Motivation (closely related to retention)
9	Techniques for enhancing self-concept (closely related to retention)
11	Knowledge of psycho/social barriers to student participation and retention
20	Knowledge of psycho/social barriers of special populations

Reading Diagnosis and Instruction:

5 Ability to diagnose basic reading skill deficiencies

18 Reading instruction (0-4)

21 Construction of informal reading inventories (they are available and should not need to be constructed by ABE teachers)

Special Needs/Learning Disabilities:

2 Learning disabilities - diagnosis and instructional techniques. Massachusetts has developed an excellent curriculum on this topic.

10 Instruction of Special Needs Adults (special needs are quite different from learning disabled)

ESL:

13 ESL instruction (basic for non-literate, and at the other end of the spectrum)

19 ESL instruction (advanced)

Others:

6 Essay Writing (GED priority)

7 Computer assisted instruction - of use only to those with access to or funds for software

8 Grantmanship can be assumed to be a need of program directors only

12 Reasoning skill and problem solving are appropriate for ABE, GED, and ESL teachers and counselors

14 Current knowledge findings should be offered in any workshop delivered and form the basis of recommended practice

16 Teaching coping/survival skills. Apparently a need of relatively new staff. So much has been offered in this area that it should it be offered again, it should clearly be directed to new employees only.

17 Employability counseling. Vital topic, however, it should be treated differently for counselors as opposed to teachers, and there are relatively few counselors. Are we talking about employability skills/counseling on reality-based career planning for the ABE classroom? Maryland has as excellent program on the latter which has been implemented state-wide.

Prior to final selection of topics, sites, schedules or trainers, other decisions have to be made. If the recommended GED staff development program is adopted, it will siphon off potential participants from other sessions of the Fall workshops. Therefore, the number of other topics addressed should be selected accordingly. If the need for a particular topic is weak, yet the topic is perceived as important, then the need has to be stimulated in some way through articles in "The Buzz," meetings/communication with program directors, or some other means.

CONCLUSION

Any effort to provide staff development must be based upon valid and systematic assessments of needs. Current methods are not sufficient nor reliable. In addition to recommendations previously made in this document regarding needs assessment, the implementation of the evaluation instrument developed by the Division in concert with the Three-year State Plan should provide valuable information. It should serve to assist in separating technical assistant needs from staff development needs and provide a profile of the status of ABE in Pennsylvania.

Staff development requires far more involvement of local program staff in the planning and delivery of training. At state as large as Pennsylvania, with such a wide array of program designs, staffing patterns, locations, populations served, and sponsoring agencies must, in order to meet the needs, offer a far greater number and variety of training opportunities.

The announced changes in the GED exam have virtually forced Pennsylvania to stop and take notice. Very specific training must be delivered to large numbers in a short period of time. If it is not, the number of candidates passing the GED in Pennsylvania will drop significantly. There is no mechanism in place or agency/institution currently involved in staff development to any great extent. Participation in staff development is low, which signals that the level of apathy among ABE professionals in the state is high. It is an environment which cannot be turned around without knowing something about the cause. Is it because long standing programs have suffered deep funding cuts while watching a tremendous amount of media attention and effort directed towards volunteer efforts and the Job Training Partnership Programs? Is it because Pennsylvania simply does not actively support adult basic education as a viable program? What effect will a comparatively small dose of state funds

from the Legislature have on any one local program, and will it be enough to spark a renewal of effort and interest?

Staff development is Pennsylvania is fraught with problems. Continuing on the current path is not the answer. However, a change in direction necessitates a commitment through major funding and a concerted effort to identify the problems and seek viable solutions.

PROJECTED COSTS

Project Officer 15-20% of institutionally supported position	$6,000
Project Director	25,000-30,000
Project Coordinator	18,000-22,000
Program/Curriculum Development Specialist	18,000-22,000
Project Secretary (1 full-time, 1 part-time)	20,000
Staff Development Advisory Board	5,000
Ad Hoc Task Forces	6,500
Talent Bank 250/program for 20 programs in year 1	5,000
GED for Program Directors	8,350
GED Teacher Training (includes per diem for 150 teachers)	22,500-34,000
ABE Teacher Training (Fall workshops, includes staff and participant per diem)	18,000
Staff travel, supplies, equipment, printing, etc.	12,000
TOTAL (without fringe benefits or overhead)	$160,000-185,000